2

3

4

5

6

7

8

23

24

25

26

Plaintiff's Complaint alleges five causes of action (fraud, negligent, misrepresentation, negligence, conversion/embezzlement, and breach of warranty) against Defendants Bank of America, N.A. ("Bank of America") and Shawn Aberman (collectively, Defendants), all of which relate to a forged cashier's check presented to the Bank by Plaintiff and Plaintiff's written instruction to wire transfer of funds to the Industrial Bank of Korea, Namdaemun Branch. Plaintiff's Complaint also asserts claims against Citibank, but, upon information and belief, Plaintiff has not served Citibank with a summons or the Complaint. According to the Complaint, Plaintiff is seeking general damages in an excess of \$10,000, special damages, economic losses, punitive damages, the imposition of a constructive trust and/or equitable lint, attorneys' fees and costs.

Defendant Bank of America's counterclaim is a breach of contract action. Defendant claims that Plaintiff's bank account is overdrawn and he has failed to repay the Bank for the overdrawn amount. Defendant Bank of America seeks the overdrawn amount of \$55,772.80, plus pre- and post-judgment interest, costs and attorneys' fees.

### II.

Statement of Jurisdiction: This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a), 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and 12 U.S.C. § 632.

With respect to federal question jurisdiction, "any civil action brought in a State court of which the district courts of the United States have original jurisdiction, may be removed by the defendant or the defendants, to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place where such action is pending." 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a). See also 28 U.S.C. § 1331 ("The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States.").

Regarding the international banking aspects of the claims asserted in this Action, 12 U.S.C. § 632 provides for federal question jurisdiction in this instance: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all suits of a civil nature at common law or in equity to which

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

any corporation organized under the laws of the United States shall be a party, arising out of transactions involving international or foreign banking, or banking in a dependency or insular possession of the United States, or out of other international or foreign **financial operations**, either directly or through the agency, ownership, or control of branches or local institutions in dependencies or insular possessions of the United States or in foreign countries, shall be deemed to arise under the laws of the United States, and the district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction of all such suits; and any defendant in any such suit may, at any time before the trial thereof, remove such suits from a State court into the district court of the United States for the proper district by following the procedure for the removal of causes otherwise provided by law." 12 U.S.C. § 632 (emphasis added).

Interpreting the Edge Act (12 U.S.C. §§ 601 et seq.) in a 2005 case involving Bank of America, the Court noted the requirements for federal jurisdiction under that act: "For a district court to exercise Edge Act jurisdiction over a civil action, that action must meet two requirements: (1) a corporation organized under the laws of the United States is a party; and (2) the action arises out of transactions involving international or foreign banking or other financial operations." Bank of America Corp. v. Lemgruber, 385 F.Supp.2d 200, 213 (S.D.N.Y. 2005). The Lemgruber case further noted that "[a] suit satisfies the jurisdictional prerequisites of Section 632 if any part of it arises out transactions involving international or foreign banking." *Id.* at 214 (emphasis in original)(quoting *In re Lloyd's* American Trust Fund Litig., 928 F.Supp. 333, 338 (S.D.N.Y. 1996) and citing Corporacion Venezolana de Fomento (CVF) v. Vintero Sales Corp., 629 F.2d 786 (2d Cir. 1980), cert. denied, 449 U.S. 1080, 101 S.Ct. 863, 66 L.Ed.2d 804 (1981)). See also Wenzoski v. Citicorp, 480 F.Supp. 1056, 1058 (N.D. Cal. 1979) (explaining that any defendant in an action where the claims allegedly "arise out of transactions involving international or foreign banking or out of other international or foreign financial operations" may remove

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

such suit to the proper United States district court, and interpreting 12 U.S.C. § 632 to mean that "unanimous joinder [by all defendants] in the removal petition was not necessary").

Lemgruber also held that the actual entity sued in this case, Bank of America, N.A., is a corporation organized under the laws of the United States, thereby satisfying the first prong of the Edge Act analysis. Consistent with that holding, Bank of America, N.A. is a national association, formed under the laws of the United States. Bank of America, N.A. is a federally chartered commercial bank, which holds FDIC Certificate No. 3510, and its charter class is that of a National Bank. See also Travis v. National City Bank of New York, 23 F.Supp. 363, 366-67 (E.D.N.Y. 1938)(discussing the legislative intent behind 12 U.S.C. § 632 and holding that the statutory phrase "any corporation organized under the laws of the United States" is not limited to corporations organized specifically to conduct foreign banking, but also includes national banks engaged incidentally in foreign banking).

This Action "arises out of transactions involving international or foreign banking," in this case, the wire transfer of funds to the Industrial Bank of Korea, Namdaemun Branch, with "2M Korea," in Seoul, Korea, as the beneficiary. Therefore, this Court has jurisdiction.

# III.

The following facts are admitted by the parties and require no proof: Because Plaintiff failed to participate in the preparation of this Pretrial Order, there are no stipulations or agreements to facts that require no proof.

## IV.

The following facts, though not admitted, will not be contested at trial by evidence to the contrary:

1. On or about October 24, 2007, Plaintiff/Counterdefendant Lombino presented a cashier's check (the "Cashier's Check") in the approximate amount of \$195,000 to Bank of America for deposit into his trust account Ш

1		with Bank of America (the "Account").
2	2.	Plaintiff/Counterdefendant Lombino instructed Bank of America to wire
3		\$185,000 from his Account to the Industrial Bank of Korea.
4	3.	In accordance with Plaintiff/Counterdefendant Lombino's instruction, Bank
5		of America completed the wire transfer of \$185,000 from his Account to the
6		Industrial Bank of Korea.
7	4.	After the completion of the wire transfer, the Cashiers Check was returned
8		unpaid due to an alleged forgery. As a result, Plaintiff/Counterdefendant
9		Lombino's Account was overdrawn in the sum of \$184,240.
10	5.	To offset the overdrawn amount, Bank of America recovered \$128,473.15
11		$from \ Plaintiff/Counter defendant \ Lombino's \ accounts \ with \ Bank \ of \ America.$
12	6.	Plaintiff/Counterdefendant Lombino's Accounts with Bank of America are
13		currently overdrawn in the sum of \$55,772.80 (the "Debt").
14	7.	Plaintiff/Counterdefendant Lombino has refused by pay the Debt.
15		V.
16	The fo	ollowing are the issues of fact to be tried and determined upon trial. (Each
17	issue of fact	must be stated separately and in specific terms.)
18	1.	May the Bank to recover the Debt resulting from Plaintiff's overdrawn
19		account from the Plaintiff?
20		VI.
21	The fo	ollowing are the issues of law to be tried and determined upon trial. (Each
22	issue of lawı	must be stated separately and in specific terms.)
23	1.	Is Plaintiff liable to Defendant Bank of America for the Debt resulting from
24		his overdrawn account?
25	2.	Is Plaintiff liable to Defendant for pre-and post judgement interest on the
26		Debt resulting from Plaintiff's overdrawn account?

3.	Is Pla	aintiff li	able to Defendants for attorneys' fees and costs?	
4.	. Is Plaintiff liable to Defendants for post judgment interest on attorneys' fi			
	and o	costs?		
			VII.	
(a)	The	followiı	ng exhibits are stipulated into evidence in this case an may be	
	so m	arked l	by the clerk: Due to Plaintiff's failure to participate in this	
	Pret	rial Oro	der, it is unknown whether the parties could stipulate to any	
	exhi	bits.		
	(1)	Plain	tiff's Exhibits: Unknown.	
	(2)	<u>Defer</u>	ndants' Exhibits: Unknown.	
<b>(b)</b>	(b) As to the following additional exhibits, the parties have rea			
	stipu	llations	states:	
	(1)	Set forth stipulations as to Plaintiff's exhibits: Unknown, due to		
		Plain	tiff's failure to participate in this Pretrial Order.	
	(2)	Set forth stipulations as to Defendants' exhibits: The following ar		
		Defer	ndants' exhibits, which Plaintiff has not stipulated or agreed to	
		admit	into evidence. Defendants reserve the right to object to any or	
		part o	of the exhibits listed below.	
		1.	Sole Proprietorship Authorization Opening and Maintaining	
			Deposit Accounts and Services.	
		2.	Sole Proprietorship Signature Card.	
		3.	State Bar of Nevada Certificate of Compliance and Consent	
			Form.	
		4.	Personal Signature Card regarding CampusEdge Checking	

Personal Signature Card regarding Interest Checking Account

account.

5.

**(c)** 

5010 0072 2488.		
Personal Signature Card regarding Regular Saving account		
number 0049 6745 7349,		
Personal Signature Card regarding Regular Checking account		
0049 6654 4826.		
Personal Signature Card regarding MyAccess Direct Checking		
account.		
Transaction History regarding account 004971933118.		
Transaction History regarding account 004971933105.		
Correspondence from Charles Lombino to Industrial Bank of		
Korea dated November 15, 2007.		
Funds Transfer Request and Authorization dated October 29,		
2007.		
Deposit Slip dated August 21, 2007.		
Copy of Check from Aristocrat Technologies to Charles		
Lombino in the amount of \$200,000.		
Depositor Agreement.		
Correspondence from Michael Poli to Charles Lombino dated		
December 14, 2007.		
Correspondence from Charles Lombino to Michael Poli dated		
December 27, 2007.		
Correspondence from Michael Poli to Charles Lombino dated		
January 16, 2008.		
llowing exhibits, the party against whom the same will be		
offered objects to their admission on the grounds stated:		

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

26

1

- (1) Set forth objections to Plaintiff's exhibits: Defendants object to any exhibits of Plaintiff on the basis that Defendants do not know which exhibits Plaintiff intends to use at trial. In addition, Defendants object to any proposed Plaintiff's exhibits on the basis that Plaintiff has not participated in the preparation of this Pretrial Order and therefore has waived any right to present exhibits.
  - (2) Set forth objections to Defendants' exhibits: Unknown.

#### **Depositions: (d)**

- (1) Plaintiff will offer the following depositions: (Indicate name of deponent and identify portions to be offered by pages and lines and the party or parties against whom offered): Unknown.
- (2) Defendants will offer the following depositions: (Indicate name of deponent and identify portions to be offered by pages and lines and the party or parties against whom offered): Defendants previously set the depositions of Plaintiff and Andrew West to take place on June 24, 2009. Within days before the deposition, Plaintiff, who is an attorney, retained legal counsel who requested that the depositions be continued to allow new counsel to become familiar with the case. Defendants agreed to continue the depositions based on this request. About a month after new counsel was substituted for Plaintiff, Plaintiff resubstituted himself as counsel of record. The depositions are currently set for September 28, 2009. Defendants reserve the right to supplement this portion of the Pretrial Order after the depositions are taken.

### **(e) Objections to Depositions:**

Defendant objects to plaintiff's depositions as follows: Plaintiff has (1) not identified any depositions. Defendants object to any deposition

1			to the extent that Plaintiff attempts to admit any deposition at trial.
2		(2)	Plaintiff objects to Defendants' depositions as follows: Unknown.
3			VIII.
4	The f	ollowi	ng witnesses may be called by the parties upon trial:
5	(a)	State	names and addresses of Plaintiff's witnesses: Unknown.
6	(b)	State	names and addresses of Defendants' witnesses:
7		(1)	Authorized representative(s) of Bank of America, c/o Poli & Ball,
8			P.L.C., 601 S. Seventh Street, Second Floor, Las Vegas, Nevada.
9		(2)	Defendant Shawn Aberman, c/o Poli & Ball, P.L.C., 601 S. Seventh
10			Street, Second Floor, Las Vegas, Nevada.
11		(3)	Without waiving any objections, Defendants reserve the right to call
12			Plaintiff Charles Lombino. 2421 Enchantment Circle, Henderson,
13			Nevada 89074.
14		(4)	Without waiving any objections, Defendants reserve the right to call
15			Andrew West. 723 Wilshire, Las Vegas, Nevada 89110.
16			IX.
17	Coun	sel ha	s met and herewith submit a list of three (3) agree-upon dates:
18	Plaint	tiff has	s not participated in this Pretrial Order. Thus, the following dates are
19	submitted by	Defe	ndants without input from the Plaintiff.
20		1.	March 29, 2009 - March 31,2009
21		2.	April 5, 2009 - April 6, 2009
22		3.	April 12, 2009 - April 13, 2009
23	It is e	xpress	ly understood by the undersigned that the Court will set the trial of this
24	matter on or	ne (1)	of the agreed-upon dates if possible, if not, the trial will be set at the
25	convenience	of the	Court's calendar.

1	<b>X.</b>			
2	It is estimated that the trial herein will take a total of 3-4 days.			
3	APPROVED AS TO FORM AND CONTENT:			
4	POLI & BALL, P.L.C.			
5	By /s/ Jody L. Buzicky Michael N. Poli poli@poliball.com Jody L. Buzicky buzicky@poliball.com 601 South Seventh Street, Second Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Attorneys for Defendant Bank of America, N.A. and Defendant Shawn Aberman			
6				
7				
8				
9				
10		IX.		
11		ACTION BY THE COURT		
12	(a)	This case is set down for Court/Jury trial on the fixed/stacked calendar		
13		on:		
14		Calendar call shall be held on:		
15	(b)	An original and two (2) copies of each trial brief shall be submitted to the		
16		clerk on or before		
17	(c)	Jury Trials:		
18		(1) An original and two (2) copies of all instructions requested by either		
19		party shall be submitted to the clerk for filing on or before		
20		·		
21		(2) An original and two (2) copies of all suggested questions of the parties		
22		to be asked of the jury panel by the Court on voir dire shall be		
23		submitted to the clerk for filing on or before		
24		·		
25	/ / /			
26	/ / /			

(d)	Court trials:
	Proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law shall be filed on or before

The foregoing Pretrial Order has been approved by the Defendants as evidenced by the signature of their counsel hereon, and the Order is hereby entered and will govern the trial of this case. This Order shall not be amended except by order of the Court pursuant to agreement of the parties or to prevent manifest injustice.

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE or UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

 $S:\ Lkl\ BA\ Lombino\ PLEADINGS\ Pretrial\ Order. wpd$